



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/205,020	12/04/1998	STEPHEN G. RYBICKI	05110/019001	9237

7590

04/09/2002

G ROGER LEE
FISH & RICHARDSON
225 FRANKLIN STREET
BOSTON, MA 021102804

EXAMINER

WANG, MARY DA ZHI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

pat

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/205,020

Applicant(s)

RYBICKI, STEPHEN G.

Examiner

Mary Wang

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 1998 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are pending.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
4. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bauer et al., U. S. Patent 5,870,759. This maintains the rejection of the previous office action, which is hereby incorporated in its entirety by reference.
5. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al., U. S. Patent 5,870,759. This maintains the rejection of the previous office action, which is hereby incorporated in its entirety by reference.
6. Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al., U. S. Patent 5,870,759 in view of Hoover et al., U. S. Patent 5,560,005. This maintains the rejection of the previous office action, which is hereby incorporated in its entirety by reference.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claim 14 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The reason for indication of allowance was stated in the previous office action.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 1/8/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument is based on whether Bauer (U. S. Patent 5,870,759) teaches proposed synchronization mode.

First, applicant states "There is no suggestion in Bauer of any choice of synchronization mode, or any scheme by which one computer has a dialog with the other computer to choose a synchronization mode". In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., choice of synchronization mode and choose a synchronization mode) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Second, applicant argues there is no possible basis for interpreting a proposed synchronization mode as the table row refresh message or timestamp of Bauer. The term "proposed synchronization mode" is not clearly defined in the independent claims. From the content of the claims, it seems to be meant an indication of a status. Thus, it does not contradict to interpret this term as the table row refresh message or timestamp, which indicate the status of message transaction and updates.

Therefore, it is believed that Bauer teaches all the limitations including the proposed synchronization mode as claimed in the independent claims 1 and 2.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2161

Inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Wang whose telephone number is (703)-305-0084. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached on (703) 305-9768.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceedings is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 (After Final Communication)
(703) 746-7239 (Official Communications)
(703) 746-7240 (For Status inquiries, draft communication)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-3900.



JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Mary Wang
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2161
April 3, 2002